UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/074,770	02/12/2002	Dennis Van De Meulenhof	PHNL 010099	7242

24737 7590 08/26/2005

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS
P.O. BOX 3001
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER	
PATEL, ASHOKKUMAR B	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2154	

DATE MAILED: 08/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/074,770	VAN DE MEULENHOF, DENNIS	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ashok B. Patel	2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 June 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-7 are subject to examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed June 21, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons:

Applicant's argument:

"It is evident that Kato fails to teach the claimed invention, inter alia, "... marking all logical node mappings on the various physical nodes as invalid, through said communicating of logical node identifiers establishing said reconfiguration, whilst executing the communicating of said functionality informations on a basis of necessity." Accordingly, claim 1 and the claims depending therefrom are believed allowable. Claim 6 and the dependent claim 7 are believed allowable for reasons similar to those discussed above."

Examiner's response:

Kato teaches in col. 4, line 22-26, " When any new device is connected to the 1394 bus 31, there occurs a bus reset, and then a bus master (e.g., controller 11) in the 1394 bus **executes a process of node ID assignment to each device and also a process of device driver assignment."**

Thus, Kato teaches "marking all logical node "mappings on the various physical nodes as invalid, through said communicating of logical node identifiers establishing said reconfiguration,"

Kato goes on teaching in col. 4, lines 49-65, "Upon reception of the response packet via the 1394 interface 58, the control unit 55 of the television receiver 41 extracts the flag and makes a decision at step S3 as to whether the flag indicates the target device or not. If the flag indicates the target device of the node, the operation proceeds to step S4, where the control unit 55 makes a decision as to whether the controller having a device driver to control the target device is already stored or not in the NUID information table stored in the memory 57. Even in the bus reset state, each controller still holds the preceding device driver held prior to occurrence of the bus reset. Since it is therefore not necessary to alter the table portion corresponding to the target device, the operation proceeds to step S6, where the control unit 55 makes another decision as to whether all the nodes have been selected or not, and if the result of this decision signifies that there is any node not selected yet, the operation returns to step S1."

Thus, Kato teaches "whilst executing the communicating of said functionality informations on a basis of necessity."

Objection to Specification

Examiner apologizes for the error of selecting item 9 on the cover sheet of the Office Action. There is no objection in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless-

> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the

applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kato et al. (US 6, 738, 835 B1).

Referring to claim 1,

The reference teaches a method for executing a re-configuration in a self-configuring digital network after occurrence of a reconfiguration trigger (col. 4, lines 22-26," (11) When any new device is connected to the 1394 bus 31, there occurs a bus reset, and then a bus master (e.g., controller 11) in the 1394 bus executes a process of node ID assignment to each device and also a process of device driver assignment."), through upon detecting such trigger, communicating between various physical nodes their respective logical node identifiers (col. 4, lines 14-21, "Suppose now that, in the state mentioned above, the connection in the bus system is so changed as shown in FIG. 5 for example. In this case, a controller 81 and a target device 82 are connected to a controller 12 via a 1394 bus 31, and a target device 83 is connected to a target device 14. The controller 81, the target device 82 and the target device 83 have, respectively, NUID81, NUID82 and NUID83 each serving as a node unique ID thereof.") and furthermore communicating functionality informations regarding the respective node stations (col. 3, lines 66 through col. 4, line 4, "It is supposed that, in the memory 57 of the television receiver 41 functioning as the controller 11, there is already stored a table which holds the relationship of mutual correspondence between the target devices in the 1394 bus system and the controllers having software elements such as device

drivers (virtual devices) to control the target devices.),

said method being characterized by, associated to such detecting, recognizing in a particular node such other nodes that before such trigger had been conducting a communication relation with said particular node (col. 4, lines 40-43," Each node contains a configuration ROM which stores therein a flag indicative of whether the relevant node has a function as a controller capable of controlling the other node or a function as a target device controlled by the other node."), marking all logical node mappings on the various physical nodes as invalid, through said communicating of logical node identifiers establishing said reconfiguration, whilst executing the communicating of said functionality informations on a basis of necessity. (col. 4, lines 49-65, "Upon reception of the response packet via the 1394 interface 58, the control unit 55 of the television receiver 41 extracts the flag and makes a decision at step S3 as to whether the flag indicates the target device or not. If the flag indicates the target device of the node, the operation proceeds to step S4, where the control unit 55 makes a decision as to whether the controller having a device driver to control the target device is already stored or not in the NUID information table stored in the memory 57. Even in the bus reset state, each controller still holds the preceding device driver held prior to occurrence of the bus reset. Since it is therefore not necessary to alter the table portion corresponding to the target device, the operation proceeds to step S6, where the control unit 55 makes another decision as to whether all the nodes have been selected or not, and if the result of this decision signifies that there is any node not selected yet, the operation returns to step S1.")

Referring to claim 2,

The reference teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein such reconfiguration undertakes to re-establish an existing mapping pattern of logical identifiers from a hitherto communication-related sub-sets among said nodes, whilst seeking replacement of interrupted communication-relations on a basis of necessity. (col. 4, lines 49-65, "Upon reception of the response packet via the 1394 interface 58, the control unit 55 of the television receiver 41 extracts the flag and makes a decision at step S3 as to whether the flag indicates the target device or not. If the flag indicates the target device of the node, the operation proceeds to step S4, where the control unit 55 makes a decision as to whether the controller having a device driver to control the target device is already stored or not in the NUID information table stored in the memory 57. Even in the bus reset state, each controller still holds the preceding device driver held prior to occurrence of the bus reset. Since it is therefore not necessary to alter the table portion corresponding to the target device, the operation proceeds to step S6, where the control unit 55 makes another decision as to whether all the nodes have been selected or not, and if the result of this decision signifies that there is any node not selected yet, the operation returns to step S1.")

Referring to claim 3,

The reference teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein upon detection of an invalid and unrestorable mapping, a network-wide query is undertaken for a replacement target node for effecting such mapping. (col. 4, lines 59-65, "Since it is therefore not necessary to alter the table portion corresponding to the target device, the

operation proceeds to step S6, where the control unit 55 makes another decision as to whether all the nodes have been selected or not, and if the result of this decision signifies that there is any node not selected yet, the operation returns to step S1.")

Referring to claim 4,

The reference teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, whilst in association with said reconfiguration storing an overall network topology in a subset made up of one or more physical nodes of the network. (Figs. 1-5).

Referring to claim 5,

The reference teaches a method as claimed in claim 1, wherein said network is based on IEEE 1394 or USB. (Fig. 1, element 31, col. 3, lines 20-27)

Referring to claim 6,

Claim 6 is a claim to a system being arranged for implementing a method as claimed in claim 1. Therefore claim 6 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 1.

Referring to claim 7,

Claim 6 is a claim to an apparatus being arranged for operating as a node station in a system as claimed in claim 6.. Therefore claim 7 is rejected for the reasons set forth for claim 6.

Conclusion

Examiner's note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures

may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ashok B. Patel whose telephone number is (571) 272-3972. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00am-5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee can be reached on (571) 272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abp
***